DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 560 TM 012 556

AUTHOR Tucker, Null A.
TITLE Collecting and Using Staff Performance Information for School Improvement.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Communication Skills; *Counselor Evaluation; County School Districts; Data Collection; Decision Making; Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethics; *Evaluation Utilization; Expectation; Interpersonal Competence; Leadership Qualities; Performance; *Personnel Evaluation; *Principals
IDENTIFIERS DeKalb School District GA; *Performance Based Evaluation; *Profile for Assessment of Leaders

ABSTRACT

Use of multiple data sources for evaluation of faculty performance by the DeKalb County (Georgia) School System is described. Focus is on two evaluations, the administrator evaluation and the counselor evaluation; the former has been employed longer than any other component of the evaluation system, while the latter is scheduled for its second administration this spring. The Profile for the Assessment of Leaders (PAL), used with administrators, covers interpersonal skills, communication skills, decision-making, planning and organization, supervision and evaluation, professional improvement, time management, level of expectations, and school climate. Each assessor responds to each behavior listed by marking "observed" or "not observed" on an answer sheet. One assessment of PAL indicated that secondary teachers whose principals scored highly on the PAL had fewer class disruptions and, as was found with elementary teachers, generally felt better about teacher-principal relations. Data from students also support the validity of PAL assessments. The process for evaluating counselor performance, which was similar to that used with principals, covered relating to others, communication, professionalism and ethics, planning and implementation, and level of expectations. (TJH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED302560

# Collecting and Using Staff Performance Information for School Improvement

Null A. Tucker
DeKalb County School System
Decatur, Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NULL A. TUCKER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting
New Orleans, Louisianna
April 5-9, 1988

TM012 554



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Collecting and Using Staff Performance Information for School Improvement

The purpose of any evaluation is for the identification of strengths and weaknesses on which to focus improvements thereby promoting a high quality program. In order to make a more valid and reliable evaluation of an employee's job performance, Georgia's DeKalb School System seeks input from a variety of sources in the evaluation of personnel. Specifically, those persons who are the recipients or users of another's services are asked to provide information into the performance evaluation process.

The use of multiple data sources is certainly not new or unique to personnel evaluation. Much of the research, however, has focused on college and university students evaluating their professors and instructors (Dowell and Neal, 1982; Overall and Marsh, 1982; and Gleason, 1986). Cashin (1978) pointed out several advantages as well as disadvantages of using student ratings. A significant advantage was that, "Students are those people who are supposed to be learning, to ignore their opinion is to ignore the crucial people" (p. 3). Cashin recommended examining several sources of information to evaluate teaching performance, and that by using a variety of sources evaluators will make more accurate and valid judgments, and therefore fairer evaluations. With a perspective similar to Cashin's, DeKalb School System personnel believed that if

performance is to be judged effective, its users must perceive it as such.

Administrators were the first to be evaluated using input from staff members. Because the inputs received from the various data sources have proven beneficial in the evaluation of administrators, the DeKalb system is using multiple data sources in its other personnel evaluations. Evaluating counselors is the second phase in the DeKalb School System's assessment of personnel performance using a client-centered approach. Assistant principals, head counselors, teachers, and students provided input into the counselor evaluation. Media specialist and instructional coordinator assessment instruments, currently being piloted, also seek input from department chairpersons, teachers, principals, and/or students. The teacher assessment instrument is being revised to also include information from those persons teachers serve -- their students. This paper describes how the information is incorporated into the evaluation process and the benefits of using multiple data sources for improving performance. The discussion focuses on two evaluations: the administrator evaluation as it has been employed the longest and the counselor evaluation scheduled for its second administration this spring.

## COLLECTING STAFF INPUT TO ASSESS LEADERS

During development of the Profile for the Assessment of Leaders (PAL), the committee of experts believed that those persons most directly affected by an administrator's

performance should have input into the evaluation. It must be emphasized that teachers do not evaluate their administrators, but respond only to how frequently a behavior has been observed.

The PAL is a low-inference assessment instrument. Administrators are assessed on the following competencies:

I. Interpersonal Skills
II. Communication Skills
III. Decision Making Skills
IV. Planning and Organizing Skills
V. Supervison and Evaluation Skills
VI. Professional Improvement
VII. Time Management
VIII. High Expectations
IX. School Climate

Each assessor reponds to each behavior listed by marking "observed" or "not observed" on an answer sheet. The immediate supervisor, the educational leader being assessed, and each member of the leader's staff complete an observation questionnaire. Anonymity of staff responses is ensured. The central computer compiles the data and displays it on a profile showing percentages of staff members at the local and systemwide levels who observed each behavior. A sample profile is displayed in Table 1. An administrator's immediate supervisor uses this information along with personal knowledge to make the evaluation.

**TABLE 1**

**THE PROFILE FOR ASSESSMENT OF LEADERS**

**INDIVIDUAL RESULTS**

| Central High | County School System |
|---|---|
| 100 Staff Members | Leadership Profile |

**Date:** 05/84

| | | Staff Ratings | | | Immediate Supervision | | Self |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Competency I:** **Indicator A.** | Skills in Relating to Others Promotes Positive Relationships | School/Dept. | Category (All High School Principals' Staff Scores) | All System-wide Administrators | Supervisor's Evaluation | Systemwide Administrators | Number |
| **Descriptors:** | | **% observed** | **% observed** | **% observed** | **% observed** | **% observed** | **% observed** |
| **A-1.** | Gives Recognition & Praise | 60 | 88 | 85 | 1 | 85 | 1 |
| **A-2.** | Demonstrates Courtesy | 71 | 91 | 90 | 1 | 90 | 1 |
| **A-3.** | Shows Interest in Staff | 65 | 83 | 91 | 1 | 86 | 1 |
| **A-4.** | Demonstrates Impartiality | 47 | 91 | 87 | 1 | 86 | 1 |

## Statistical Treatments

Several research studies have been conducted on the PAL results during the past five years. One study was conducted to determine if the teachers (subordinate) scores of their principal on the PAL correlated with the results of a student Time-Off-Task survey. This survey was administered in 104 schools. Teachers were asked to respond to a 200 item list of factors that cause students to become off task during allocated instructional time. Sample items from the questionnaire were student misbehavior, student tardiness to class, forgotten homework, intercom interruptions, etc. The PAL results and the Time-Off-Task results were matched for each school and then correlated.

The findings showed that secondary teachers whose principals scored high on the PAL had less class disruptions with student misbehavior, ($r = -.69$ $p<.01$); teachers having to document their every move, e.g. busy work as perceived by the teachers ($r = -.68$ $p<.01$); and teachers spending class time writing hall passes, collecting money, completing failure and detention reports, etc. ($r = -57$ $p<.05$). When principals scored high on the Planning and Organizing competency, teachers had less problems with students' forgotten or incomplete homework ($r = -.54$ $p<.05$); student absence from school ($r = -.58$ $p=<.05$) and students' daydreaming during class ($r = -.61$ $p<.05$). See Table 2.

In the elementary schools, the findings showed that the principal who scored high on the PAL had teachers who

**TABLE 2**

**SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP EVALUATION RESULTS**

**1984 CORRELATED WITH THE TOP TEN DISTRACTORS FROM THE 100-ITEM TIME-ON-TASK SURVEY**

| DISTRACTORS (Time-Off-Task Factors) | Competency 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Forgotten or Incomplete Homework | -.13 | -.31 | -.42 | *-.54 | -.43 | -.26 | -.38 | -.41 |
| 2. Having to Help Students Make up Work | -.12 | -.19 | -.24 | -.26 | -.01 | -.17 | -.15 | -.15 |
| 3. Absenteeism of Students | -.13 | -.17 | -.29 | *-.58 | -.32 | -.04 | -.29 | -.31 |
| 4. Having to Document Every Move | -.50 | *-.56 | **-.66 | **-.69 | *-.56 | *-.58 | *-.63 | **-.68 |
| 5. Writing Hall Passes, Collecting Money, Failure Slips, Detention Slips | *-.51 | -.62 | **-.70 | *-.61 | -.30 | -.47 | -.48 | *-.57 |
| 6. Minor Student Misbehavior | *-.60 | **-.67 | **-.70 | *-.61 | *-.57 | *-.53 | *-.54 | **-.69 |
| 7. Tardy to Class | -.25 | -.24 | -.30 | -.50 | -.39 | -.11 | -.23 | -.35 |
| 8. Checking in Homework | -.04 | -.06 | -.23 | -.32 | -.14 | -.10 | -.28 | -.17 |
| 9. Student Daydreaming | -.17 | -.32 | -.36 | *-.61 | -.37 | -.26 | -.24 | -.39 |
| 10. Preparing Lesson Plans | -.41 | -.27 | -.35 | -.34 | -.11 | -.24 | *-.52 | -.34 |

Secondary Schools N = 13

*p <.05

**p <.01

experienced fewer problems with documenting every move, ($r = -.38$ $p < .05$), preparing lengthy lesson plans, ($r = -.36$ $p < .05$) and student discipline problems, ($r = -.34$ $p < .05$). Elementary principals who scored high in Planning and Organizing had teachers who had less problems with student tardies, ($r = -.41$ $p < .01$) and student misbehavior, ($r = -.41$ $p < .01$). It is interesting to note that the more time the principal supervises (classroom observation, Competency V) and evaluates teachers, the less problems with student daydreaming during class, ($r = -.37$ $p < .05$). See Table 3.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the correlations of elementary school principals' scores and the distractors identified by elementary school teachers are not as strong as those relating to high schools. Still, the better the elementary school principal scored on individual competencies and on the PAL as a whole, the less problems the staff had with the off task distractors. Also in both elementary and high school, teachers who work with principals who are competent in the seven areas on the PAL perceived less problems with paperwork, with student discipline, and with student attitudes.

Another study compared the data generated by elementary and secondary school staffs on the PAL (including two experimental competencies added for the 1985 administration) with the ten DeKalb School Morale/Climate factors.

1. I enjoy working in this school/department.

2. I am proud of the work that is done by my peers.

**TABLE 3**

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP EVALUATION RESULTS**

**CORRELATED WITH THE TOP TEN DISTRACTORS FROM THE 100-ITEM TIME-ON-TASK SURVEY**

| | Competency | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DISTRACTORS (Time-Off-Task Factors) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Totals |
| 1. Having to Document Every Move | **-.40 | -.29 | *-.35 | -.29 | -.27 | *-.35 | -.22 | *-.36 |
| 2. Lesson Planning | *-.34 | -.29 | *-.34 | *-.36 | **-.40 | *-.35 | *-.36 | *-.36 |
| 3. Problems Heating/Air Conditioning | -.02 | -.26 | -.18 | -.11 | -.25 | -.10 | -.24 | -.16 |
| 4. Student Tardiness | -.22 | -.29 | -.27 | **-.41 | *-.32 | -.24 | -.31 | -.29 |
| 5. Water/Restroom Breaks | *-.33 | -.16 | -.28 | -.20 | -.26 | -.24 | -.21 | -.28 |
| 6. Forgotten Homework | -.17 | -.18 | -.20 | -.25 | -.26 | -.16 | -.14 | -.19 |
| 7. Help Students Make Up Work | -.18 | -.07 | -.12 | -.15 | -.23 | -.13 | -.18 | -.15 |
| 8. Checking in Homework | -.26 | -.03 | -.16 | -.13 | -.08 | -.11 | -.03 | -.13 |
| 9. Minor Student Misbehavior | -.29 | *-.35 | *-.34 | **-.41 | *-.33 | *-.30 | -.27 | *-.34 |
| 10. Student Daydreaming | -.16 | -.20 | -.19 | -.29 | *-.37 | -.20 | *-.32 | -.23 |

Elementary Schools N = 36

*p <.05

**p <.01

3. My professional opinions are important to my peers.
4. The professional opinions of my peers are important to me.
5. My professional opinions are important to my principal.
6. My principal's professional opinions are important to me.
7. I am proud of the way our students represent this school.
8. I am proud of the way our staff members represent this school.
9. I am proud of the way our principal represents this school.
10. The principal and staff members have high expectations of the students in this school.

The coefficients were extremely high for all competencies and were statistically significant at the .001 level. The highest relationship for both secondary and elementary schools was in Competency IV, Planning and Organizing Skills with r=.85 and r=.83 respectively. The lowest relationship for elementary was in Competency VI, Professsional Improvement with r=.63. After analyzing these data, one could conclude that teachers whose principals possess the PAL competencies feel that the moral and/or the climate of the school is conducive to good teaching and learning. See Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

**PROFILE FOR ASSESSMENT OF LEADERS (PAL)**

**NINE GENERIC COMPETENCIES SUBORDINATE SCORES CORRELATED WITH SCHOOL CLIMATE SCORES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

| | Elementary Principals | Secondary Principals |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Interpersonal Skills | ***.76 | **.71 |
| 2. Communication Skills | ***.70 | **.76 |
| 3. Decision Making Skills | ***.76 | ***.77 |
| 4. Planning and Organizing Skills | ***.85 | ***.83 |
| 5. Supervision and Evaluation Skills | ***.71 | **.72 |
| 6. Professional Improvement | ***.57 | **.63 |
| 7. Time Management | ***.73 | ***.74 |
| 8. High Expectation - Student | ***.75 | **.70 |
| 9. High Expectation - Teacher | ***.52 | ***.75 |

Elementary N = 52

*p <.05

**p <.01

***p <.001

The Stepwise Multiple Regression procedure was applied to the scores on the PAL competencies and scores on the school morale/climate survey. Table 4 (elementary schools) lists the competencies in order from the weakest relation to climate, Step 1 - Time Management, to the strongest relation, Step 9 - Planning and Organizing. In secondary schools the weakest relation was Step 1, High Expectation - Teacher and the strongest relation was the same as the elementary schools. See Table 5.

In viewing the data, elementary school staffs seem to believe that good school climate is generated by a principal that has good planning and organization skills, good interpersonal skills, and high expectations of teachers. The data suggest that secondary school teachers believe school climate is positive if principals have good planning and organizing skills, protect allocated time-on-task, and have high expectations for students.

Table 6 illustrates the results of the PAL principal assessment scores correlated with his/her school's sixth grade California Achievement Test (CAT) scores, (elementary schools N= 78), and number of student and teacher absences (secondary and elementary schools N=96). There were statistically significant correlations for all three variables. The data showed significant correlations for all three variables: principals who scored high on the PAL also had higher sixth grade CAT scores and better student and teacher attendance.

**TABLE 5**

**STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION (STEP BACKWARDS) WITH NINE PROFILE FOR LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES (PAL) SUBORDINATE SCORES AND THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE - SCHOOL CLIMATE SUBORDINATE SCORES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

| Elementary Schools | Secondary Schools |
|---|---|
| Step 1 . . . . Time Management | Step 1 . . . . High Expectation - Teacher |
| Step 2 . . . . Decision Making | Step 2 . . . . Decision Making |
| Step 3 . . . . Professional Improvement | Step 3 . . . . Supervision and Evaluation |
| Step 4 . . . . High Expectation - Students | Step 4 . . . . Communication |
| Step 5 . . . . Communication | Step 5 . . . . Interpersonal Skills |
| Step 6 . . . . Supervision and Evaluation | Step 6 . . . . Professional Improvement |
| Step 7 . . . . High Expectation - Teacher | Step 7 . . . . High Expectation - Students |
| Step 8 . . . . Interpersonal Skills | Step 8 . . . . Time Management |
| Step 9 . . . . Planning and Organizing | Step 9 . . . . Planning and Organizing |

Elementary N = 52

Secondary N = 16

**TABLE 6**

**PROFILE FOR ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP (PAL)**

**NINE GENERIC COMPETENCIES SUBORDINATE SCORES CORRELATED WITH THREE ELEMENTARY AND TWO SECONDARY SCHOOL VARIABLES**

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Variable #1 | CAT Scores - Reading & Math (6th) | ***.36 |
| Variable #2 | Student Absences - Number Days Absent | *-.20 |
| Variable #3 | Employee Absences - Number Days Absent | *-.26 |

N = 78 Variable #1
N = 96 Variable #2-6

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

## Discussion

Only the data generated by the staff responses for the elementary and secondary principals were used for these studies. Because the supervisors of the principals responded "observed" to all of the behaviors with very few exceptions, one would tend to conclude that either the supervisor did not know how the principal behaved to the "generic" leadership behaviors or that the principal behaved differently with his/her supervisor than with his/her own staff. One could also conclude that the more valid scores of a leader's behavior stems from his/her staff.

## Using PAL Results for Improvement

A profile similar to that in Table 1 allows each administrator to compare his/her results with the cumulative percentages of all educational leaders in the system with the same title and also with all educational leaders in the system regardless of title. Each profile is analyzed in a post-assessment conference between the supervisor and the administrator being assessed. During this conference, strengths and needs indicated on the profile are discussed, and a staff development plan aimed at correcting assessed needs is designed by the leader with the supervisor. The form used for planning improvements is displayed in Table 7.

Also in this post-assessment conference, a date is set for the next staff input into evaluation. Evaluation by the supervisor is required annually. Staff input must occur at

TABLE 7

LEADERSHIP EVALUATION - ANNUAL SUMMARY

Adm. Name _____

Title _____

School/Dept. _____

Immediate Supervisor _____ Date _____

Evaluation Summary (Should be based on following data: latest Profile showing staff assessment; progress made on most recent staff development plan; progress made toward goal achievement; and other pertinent data)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date of next scheduled staff participation _____

Staff Development Plans:

Competency _____ Indicator _____ Descriptor _____

Describe plan; list resources (materials and people) and specify dates for activities:

_____

_____

_____

Competency _____ Indicator _____ Descriptor _____

Describe plan; list resources (materials and people) and specify dates for activities:

_____

_____

_____

Competency _____ Indicator _____ Descriptor _____

Describe plan; list resources (materials and people) and specify dates for activities:

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Signature of Administrator Signature of Immediate Supervisor

least once every four years and should be more often if monitoring of improvement is needed. After the next staff input, improvement will be measured by comparing the last assessment profile with a new profile. The effectiveness of the staff development plan and the administrator's capacity or willingness to improve will both be reflected in the amount of improvement from one period staff input to the next.

The staff development program is a vital component of the PAL process. Information gleaned from the PAL results has provided the Department of Staff Development with a clear direction for designing meaningful training opportunities. Staff Development personnel receive a systemwide composite profile for each competency and indicator to be used in their planning. No individual profiles are released unless a specific administrator shares this with staff development personnel. To provide assistance to all administrators, the following services are offered:

(1) A leadership resource center with books, periodicals, films, cassettes, video tapes and training program, organized by competency: Each administrator can check out these materials for personal use or in conjunction with someone from staff development.

(2) Field-based, masters degree programs for future leaders: The Department of Educational Administration from Georgia State University developed and implemented a

graduate program for future administrators based on the competencies in the PAL instrument. There were 165 applicants for the program and 41 were selected to participate. Thirty-four candidates completed the program. Each participant was assessed at the beginning of the program on each competency, and the content of the field program was based on assessed needs and deficiencies. At the end of the program, each candidate was placed in a field internship program and evaluated again on the competencies outlined in the PAL instrument.

(3) Workshops: Half day and full day workshops are offered during the year on each competency. Administrators may participate in activities based on their PAL results.

(4) Graduate field-based sixth year program: Currently, there is a field-based, sixth year program conducted in cooperation with Georgia State University for persons in administrative positions. These participants have the opportunity to develop skills in each of the competency areas on the PAL instrument.

(5) Administrators Project: All beginning principals and selected other principals participate in an action oriented training program. Administrators are trained to assess needs in their schools, to develop plans for intervention, and to establish methods to measure progress. The Department of Staff Development and three external consultants have designed and are implementing this program.

## COLLECTING CLIENT INPUT TO ASSESS COUNSELORS

The process for evaluating counselor performance was similar to that used for the PAL. Counselors were evaluated on the following competencies :

I. Relating to Others

II. Communications

III. Professionalism/Ethics

IV. Planning and Implementing

V. High Expectations

Data were collected on all counselors from four sources: school administrators including the head counselor (but not the principal), teachers, students, and a counselor's self-evaluation. Principals or their representatives administered the observation form to teachers (N=3,653). Teachers administered the student form of the instrument during homeroom. Students (N=21,771) completed questionnaires only for the counselor to whom they were assigned. The time required for completion of the teacher and student forms was generally 10 to 15 minutes. All respondents remained anonymous and results were confidential.

Results for each counselor were compiled and distributed to the counselor's principal. The principal received a profile on each counselor which included the following: (a) a summary of local and systemwide student responses to each item delineated by grade levels, (b) a summary of local and systemwide teacher responses to each

item and (c) a counselor's self-evaluation. A sample counselor's profile is depicted in Table 8.

In a conference with each counselor, the principal provided a copy of all data collected and reviewed the data with the counselor. Using the data from the four data sources -- administrators, teachers, students, and self -- along with personal observations and knowledge, the principal then evaluated the quality of a counselor's performance. Principals rated a counselor's performance by circling one of the following:

A = Exceeds Performance Expectations

B = Meets Performance Expectations

C = Needs Improvement in Performance

D = Not Observed

E = Not Applicable

Profile data remained in the principal's files; a summary, by competency, of the principal's evlauation was forwarded to the system's personnel department.

## Results and Discussion

A significant finding was that the totals of teacher and student responses in the "always" and "often" categories showed that the instrument discriminated among counselors' performances. When combining student and teacher responses, scores ranged from 42.40 to 82.30 with a mean of 68.63 and a median of 69.40. See Table 9.

Before using student and teacher input, however, principals' evaluations of counselors did not discriminate

**TABLE 8**

**PROFILE OF COUNSELOR ASSESSMENT DATA FOR USE BY THE PRINCIPAL**

Counselor's Name _____ School _____

**COMPETENCY I - RELATING TO OTHERS**

| | Self | | | | | Principal's Evaluation (circle one) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I-A Promotes Positive Relationships | A | B | C | D | E | | | | | |
| 1. Gives Recognition and Praise | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 2. Demonstrates Courtesy | | X | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 3. Shows Interest in Students/Staff | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| I-B Is Able To Mediate Conflicts | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Recognizes Conflict | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 5. Sensitive to Needs | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 6. Analyzes Conflict | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. Plans for Resolution of Conflict | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| I-C Willingness To Work With Others | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Available as a Resource Person | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 9. Encourages Student Referrals | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 10. Accessible to Faculty | | X | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. Accessible to Students | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. Caring Attitude with Students | X | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |

A = Exceeds Performance Expectations
B = Meets Performance Expectations
C = Needs Improvement in Performance
D = Not Observed
E = Not Applicable

**COMPETENCY I SUMMARY**

| | |
|---|---|
| % of Total Student Responses (N=476) for this counselor that were Always or Often | 71% |
| % of Total Student Responses Systemwide (N=21,771) that were Always or Often | 76% |
| % of Total Teacher Responses for this counselor (N=82) that were Always or Often | 78% |
| % of Total Teachers Responses Systemwide (N=3,653) that were Always or Often | 72% |

TABLE 9

COUNSELOR ASSESSMENT

DISTRIBUTION OF MEAN BY STANDARD DEVIATION

| Counselor-Name | School | Rank | % of Total Student/ Teacher Responses That Were ALWAYS or OFTEN |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 82.30 |
| | | 2 | 80.65 |
| | | 3 | 79.85 |
| | | 4 | 79.45 |
| | | 5 | 79.25 |
| | | 6 | 78.65 |
| | | 7 | 78.40 |
| | | 8 | 78.05 |
| | | 9 | 77.00 |
| | | 10 | 76.70 |
| | | 11 | 76.65 |
| Total Score - 1 Standard Deviation Above the Mean | | | |
| | | 12 | 76.40 |
| | | 13 | 76.20 |
| | | 14 | 75.70 |
| | | 15 | 75.35 |
| | | 16 | 73.95 |
| | | 17 | 73.90 |
| | | 18 | 73.20 |
| | | 19 | 72.75 |
| | | 20 | 72.70 |
| | | 21 | 72.60 |
| | | 22 | 72.40 |
| | | 23 | 72.15 |
| | | 24 | 72.05 |
| | | 25 | 71.70 |
| | | 25 | 71.70 |
| | | 27 | 71.50 |
| | | 28 | 71.25 |
| | | 29 | 71.05 |
| | | 30 | 69.60 |
| | | 30 | 69.60 |
| | | 32 | 69.45 |
| | | 33 | 69.40 |
| | | 34 | 69.20 |
| | | 35 | 68.65 |
| | | 35 | 68.65 |
| | | Mean | 68.63 |
| | | 37 | 68.60 |
| | | 38 | 68.25 |
| | | 39 | 68.00 |
| | | 40 | 67.95 |
| | | 41 | 67.85 |
| | | 42 | 66.70 |
| | | 43 | 66.10 |
| | | 44 | 66.05 |
| | | 44 | 66.05 |
| | | 46 | 65.90 |
| | | 47 | 65.75 |
| | | 48 | 65.45 |
| | | 48 | 65.45 |
| | | 50 | 65.05 |
| | | 51 | 64.15 |
| | | 52 | 62.15 |
| | | 53 | 61.40 |
| | | 54 | 61.40 |
| Total Score - 1 Standard Deviation Below The Mean | | | |
| | | 55 | 60.25 |
| | | 56 | 58.55 |
| | | 57 | 58.40 |
| | | 58 | 57.65 |
| | | 59 | 57.50 |
| | | 60 | 57.05 |
| | | 61 | 56.85 |
| | | 62 | 56.60 |
| | | 63 | 54.00 |
| Total Score - 2 Standard Deviations Below The Mean | | | |
| | | 64 | 50.95 |
| | | 65 | 44.05 |
| | | 66 | 42.40 |

among good and poor performances because almost everyone scored well. When using the information gleaned from teachers and students, however, there was a wide range of scores. In fact, when correlating teacher and student responses, there was a high positive correlation ($r=.6205$ $p<.001$). One can conclude that the instrument is reliable in discriminating among counselors' performances.

### Using Counselor Results for Improvement

The evaluation process does not end once the principal has made his/her evaluation. The principal, with input from the counselor, develops a written plan for improvement or enrichment to be implemented during the year. See Table 10. The improvement plan includes the following criteria: (a) a specific area where improvement is expected, (b) specific activities, (c) a time line for completing the plan, (d) resources, and (e) a plan for monitoring progress. The enrichment plan assumes that the counselor exceeds performance expectations in all competencies and therefore specifies work in the areas that would be of personal and professional benefit. This plan may be written in any form that is meaningful to the counselor and to the principal. Thus, evaluation results are used to design an individual plan whereby counselors can improve their performances.

## ADDITIONAL USES FOR EVALUATION RESULTS

In many cases, an extensive personal improvement plan like that used in DeKalb may not be needed because the awareness can serve as a mighty stimulus for improvement.

**TABLE 10**

**COUNSELOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT/ENRICHMENT PLAN**

| Counselor's Name | School/Dept. | Date | Evaluator's Name |
|---|---|---|---|

**Evaluation Summary** (Based on profile of teacher and student data and summary evaluation - cite strengths, areas for improvement)

**Staff Development/Enrichment Plan** - Specific activities, dates for completion, plans for monitoring

**Competency** ___

**Competency** ___

**Competency** ___

Counselor's Signature _____ Date _____

DISTRIBUTION: WHITE-PRINCIPAL CANARY-EMPLOYEE PINK-SUPPORT PERSON

Those undergoing evaluation may need only to recognize that their efforts need to be directed to a particular area. In those cases, areas of weakness can be quickly remediated. For example, counselors could increase their visibility -- one of the areas where they scored low -- simply by making an extra effort to attend school-related activities.

Results from the evaluation provide a look not only at individual performance, but also at a school's overall program. Thus, the results can be used to make decisions concerning a program. If, for example, results suggest that teachers and students approach one counselor more than another, then duties may need to be reassigned. This building on individual strengths is another way to improve performance, resulting in program improvement.

In addition to planning for improvement of performance and programs, it is possible to use the results from an evaluation to determine reasons behind them. For example, an astute principal knows when a problem exists with a staff member -- phone calls, parent complaints, frequent student visits to the office. These maladies, however, are symptoms of a problem and do not necessarily indicate the cause. The results from a performance evaluation can be a valuable way to discover a symptom's origin.

Because the items in the evaluation instrument are realistic expectations of performance based on role and function rather than outcomes, the content can be used as a set of job expectations for personnel, especially those new

to a position. Although the items are not a complete listing of all responsibilities, the evaluation instrument can be used as a checklist to ensure that one is performing essential duties.

## BENEFITS OF USING MULTIPLE DATA SOURCES

In the DeKalb School System, areas of weakness pinpointed by the evaluation process are the focus for staff development courses or inservices. By using input from a variety of sources, however, the evaluation results tend to be more accurate indications of performance. There are several other advantages, however, to using multiple data sources in personnel evaluation.

Most significantly, the use of multiple data sources reduces the time that a supervisor would spend in making lengthy observations or in scrutinizing reports and records. Furthermore, when the supervisor reviews the results from the various data sources, he/she gains a different and broader perspective of an individual's performance.

Miller and Jenkins (1978) pointed out that principals and counselors spend a fairly unstructured day responding to a variety of demands. In addition, they encounter a great deal of confusion and naivete about their roles on the part of students and teachers. When someone responds to a list of job performance behaviors, then they become more aware of the numerous responsibilities of principals and counselors. Consequently, the assessment process can be a learning experience for others. In the case of counselors, teachers

as well as principals will become more aware of counselor services and will make use of them. Additionally, this broader knowledge of counselor services may initiate interaction between teachers, counselors, and principals. Furthermore, when effectiveness is demonstrated through the evaluation process, then one's credibility increases.

## SUMMARY

Results from the statistical treatments on the administrator and counselor evaluations indicated that input from staff members and users did discriminate among performances. Administrators' scores were more valid when coming from staff members. Students' and teachers' perceptions of counselors' performances were highly correlated indicating the reliability of the measure.

In the DeKalb School System, evaluation results are used extensively in planning for improvement in individuals' performances as well as for program improvement. The results are invaluable for focusing staff development and inservice courses. What is unique to the DeKalb School System's method for evaluating personnel is that persons other than the immediate supervisor inputs into the evaluation. By using information from a variety of sources, a supervisor obtains a broader and more realistic perspective about an individual's job performance. Furthermore, by using information from a variety of sources, the supervisor spends less time in the evaluation process.

As Cashin (1978) noted, no one evaluation instrument or method is flawless, but we cannot wait for the perfect one to come along before we evaluate. A more accurate and fair evaluation of performance can be made, however, by using input from a variety of sources.

## References

Cashin, W. E., (1978). Sources of information upon which to base evaluation of college teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 213)

Dowell, D.A. and Neal, J.A. (1982). A selective review of the validity of student ratings of teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 53:1, 51-61.

Gleason, M. (1986). Getting a perspective on student evaluation. AAHE Bulletin, (February 1986), 10-13.

Miller, R. and Jenkins, E. Accountability, competency, and non-teaching faculty. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 789)

Overall, J.U. and Marsh, H.W. (1982). Students' evaluations of teaching: An update. AAHE Bulletin, (December 1982), 9-12.